

REMARKS

Claims 1-86 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-30, 34-72, and 75-86 stand rejected based variously on sections 102, 112, and 101 of Title 35 of the U.S. Code. The Examiner indicates that claims 31-32 and 73-74 are allowable if re-written in independent form. Claim 1-4, 6, 48-51 and 53 stand rejected on the grounds of non-statutory double patenting of co-pending application 10/575,140.

In response to these rejections, the Applicant has amended dependent claim 31 to include the limitations of independent claim 1 and intervening dependent claims 2, and 29-30. The Applicant has also amended claim 73 to include the limitations of independent claim 48 and intervening dependent claims 49 and 72. The Applicant has also amended claims 33 to now depend from claim 32 and claim 75 to depend from 73.

Additionally, the Applicant has canceled claims 1-30, 34-72, and 76-86. As such, all of the remaining claims, claims 31-33 sand73-75, recite subject matter that the Examiner has indicated is patentable over the prior art of record. Additionally, none of the claims against which a double patenting rejection was asserted remain in the application. As such, the Applicant respectfully maintains that the pending claims are all patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner also objected to the Specification in Paragraph V of the Office Action for inclusion of hyperlinks within the Specification, on pp. 7-8 and 41. Appropriate amendments to the relevant paragraphs are included herein.

CONCLUSION

Based on all these considerations and amendment, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is again urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,

LANDIS

By his attorneys,

UNISYS CORPORATION
801 Lakeside Drive, Suite 100
Blue Bell, PA 19424
(215) 986-3325

Date: January 6, 2011

By /Richard J. Gregson/
Richard J. Gregson
Reg. No. 41,804